REMARKS

A. Status of the Application

- Claims **1-7, 9-11, 20** and **31-49** are pending, of which claims **1** and **35** are independent claims.

- Claims **1-7, 9-11** and **20** are amended.

- Claims **8, 12-19** and **21-30** are cancelled.

- Claims **31-49** are added. No new matter has been introduced.

Accordingly, entry of the amendments and new claims is respectfully requested. Applicants have amended the claims to recite particular embodiments that Applicants, in their business judgment, have determined to be commercially desirable at this time. The claim amendments have not been submitted for any reasons relating to patentability.

Applicants intend to pursue the subject matter of the previously cancelled claims, in one or more continuing applications.

B. Abstract

On page 3, the Examiner states the following: "Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure." In particular, the Examiner states that "[i]t is important that the abstract no exceed 150 words in length."

However, Applicants' abstract comprises 141 words, which is well within the 150 word parameter. The abstract appears to abide with all the requirements listed by the Examiner.

Without additional information or more specificity from the Examiner, it is impossible to discern the Examiner's issues with the Applicants' abstract. Thus, the Examiner fails to make a *prima facie* case against Applicants' abstract.

C. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, para. 1

On page 4, the Examiner rejected claims **1** and **12** under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 for allegedly "failing to comply with the written description requirement." The rejection is moot in light of the claim amendments.

D. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

On page 4, the Examiner rejected claims **12-19** and **25-30** under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The rejection is moot in light of the claim amendments.

E. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 6, the Examiner rejected claims **1-30** under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,905,974 ("Fraser") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,168,446 ("Wiseman"). The rejection of claims **1-30** under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot in light of the claim amendments.

Specifically, the cited-portions of Fraser and Wiseman fail to teach or suggest the following limitation of independent claims **1** and **35**:

> … ***map the second plurality of keys*** such that ***each key of the second plurality of keys corresponds to a non-benchmark issue*** related to the first benchmark issue; and ***place an order*** for the non-benchmark issue ***in response to one of the second plurality of keys being pressed***

(emphasis added). Nowhere in the cited-portions of either Fraser or Wiseman is there a teaching or suggestion of the "*map[ping] of [a] plurality of keys*" in a manner that pressing one of the keys "*places an order for a non-benchmark instrument,*" as recited by Applicants' independent claims **1** and **35**.

Neither do the cited-portions of Fraser or Wiseman teach or suggest the additional limitation of claims **1** and **35**:

> ... in response to the second key being pressed after the first key was pressed, direct the display device to: ***switch, from the first quadrant, to select a second quadrant*** that displays the second benchmark issue; and ***re-map the second plurality of keys*** such that each key of the second plurality of keys corresponds to a non-benchmark issue related to the second benchmark issue.

Nowhere in the cited-portions of either Fraser or Wiseman is there a teaching or suggestion of "switching" from a first quadrant to a second quadrant and "*re-mapping a second plurality of keys*" so that each key corresponds to a "*non-benchmark issue*" related to the "*second benchmark issue that is displayed in the second quadrant,*" as recited by Applicants' independent claims **1** and **35**.

For at least these reason, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claims **1** and **35** (and the claims that depend therefrom).

F. General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually. However, Applicants do not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in

the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address the patentability of the dependent claims in the future, if deemed necessary.

G. Authorization for Email Communication

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, Applicants hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with any authorized representative concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. Applicants understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

H. Conclusion

In general, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at (857) 413-2056 or via e-mail at: rma@cantor.com.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 25, 2009

Customer No:
Innovation Group
Cantor Fitzgerald, LLP
110 E. 59th Street
New York, NY 10002

____/Ruth J. Ma/_____
Ruth J. Ma, Reg. No. 55,414
Attorney for Applicant
Tel. No. (857) 413-2056
Fax. No. (857) 413-2019